IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CIVIL REVISION NO. 146 OF 2005 Single Bench

APPLICANT : Chandan Singh Son of Shri Ashok Singh, aged about 27 years, Resident of Qr. No. 274, Bhatgaon, Post Bhatgaon, Out Post Bhatgaon, Tahsil Pratappur, District Surguja (C.G.), (**UNSOUND MIND**).

Through: his natural guardian father Shri Ashok Singh Son of Shri Ranjit Singh, aged about 50 years, Resident of Qr. No. 274, Bhatgaon, Post Bhatgaon, Out Post Bhatgaon, Tahsil Pratappur, District Surguja (C.G.).

P.R. No. 3187/05 Sushil Dubey
Presented on 13/12/05
dated

VERSUS

NON-APPLICANT : NONE

CIVIL REVISION UNDER SECTION 115 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, 1908

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक C.R. No. 146/05 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

19.12.2005

Shri Sushil Dubey, learned counsel for the applicant.

Heard.

The applicant has preferred this revision against the order date 24.09.2005 passed by learned Third Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (F.T.C.) Ambikapur and by which the application of the applicant to release the amount which has been deposited in the fixed deposit account of the claimant has been rejected.

The instant application is at the instance of the applicant acting through his natural guardian. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that in all Rs. 3,05,000/- was awarded to the claimant. However, only Rs. 1,50,000/- has been disbursed to the claimant and the remaining amount have been deposited in the fixed deposit account of the claimant. The applicant filed an application before the trial Court as the amount so deposited is required by the applicant but the trial Court without considering the above reasons rejected the application on the ground that the applicant has already been paid cash of Rs. 1,50,000/- towards treatment and there is no evidence adduced by the applicant to show that the amount sought to be withdrawn has been spent by the applicant for his treatment.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant, perused the impugned order, I do not find any illegality in this order which requeires interference by this Court and accordingly the revision is rejected.

In view of the above, I.A. No. 3313/2005 stands disposed of.

Sd/-
Dhirendra Mishra
Judge

[पीछे देखिये